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**10 Risk and Problem Items**

1. The FBI didn’t have a blueprint to guide hardware and software investment decisions.
2. Use of the flash cutover, logging off from ACS on Friday afternoon and logging into the new system Monday morning was a risky maneuver.
3. Integration of the development work done in the eight different teams created to finish VCF faster.
4. Reliance on DynCorp’s delivery of the computers and networks by July for testing. (a target that they missed)
5. Very high necessity for security; any breach can lead to a compromise of national security.
6. Unnecessarily complex, and virtually unreadable 800 page requirements document.
7. Extremely high budget project.
8. Overwhelming amount of change requests caused periodic increases in cost estimates and delays.
9. Requirements of the project were simply not defined completely and correctly.
10. High level documents, including concept of operations, systems architecture and requirements did not map to user needs.

**How to Mitigate Risks**

Mitigation of risk (8): The VCF was a “build it fast and tune it up” strategy- something that the article explicitly says to avoid. First of all the VCF project needed a defined and clear set of requirements. After these clear requirements were set, feasibility analysis would have been used to make sure that these were buildable within the budgets and schedules. Furthermore, the FBI should have consulted independent experts to validate that their estimates were in the ballpark.

Mitigation of Risk(2): Using feasibility evidence, managers of the VCF project would take into account that there already was evidence stating flash cutovers are extremely risky maneuvers in the IT business . Using such a procedure needed a risk management plan ( as defined in the 6th bullet point of the feasibility evidence description). This risk management plan should have included fail-safe in case the VCF deployment goes awry. Such a plan was never created, and ultimately the flash cutover was too risky to carry out.

Mitigation of Risk (10): There was no evidence gathered that the high level documents- including the operational concept, the systems architecture as well as the requirements ever generated satisfactory outcomes for all of the success critical stakeholders, particularly the agents (the users of the application). The VCF team should have gathered data on whether or not their concept was satisfactory to the stakeholders, and furthermore used the evidence as a basis to proceed. Instead of that however, the team seemed to take “shots in the dark”- developing a certain feature and then asking for feedback as to what needed to be changed. This in turn led to the overwhelming change requests, as what was being developed was not tailored towards the needs of the users.